Remarks

The Examiner has rejected Claims 6-24 and 27-28 under 35 USC 112 as indefinite. Claim 6 has been amended to correct antecedent issues. The Applicants submit that Claim 6 is now allowable. Claims 7-12 are dependent from Claim 6, and are submitted to be patentable as their parent Claim 6.

Claim 13 has been amended to overcome the Examiner's objection to the preamble of the claim. Dependent Claims 14 to 17 have been amended to be consistent with their parent Claim 13. The Applicants submit that Claims 13-17 are now allowable.

Claims 18-24 have been amended in a manner similar to Claims 13-17. The Applicants submit that Claims 18-24 are now allowable.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejection of Claims 6, 18 and 27, as being unclear as to how multicast data packets will be monitored when the only session that is established is a unicast session. Claim 6 as amended specifically recites:

"identifying multicast data packets associated with a multicast group;

monitoring transmissions of said multicast data packets between said intermediate device and said dedicated terminal by user devices".

It is therefore clear that Claim 6 as amended recites the existence of multicast data packets. Similarly, Claim 18 as amended recites:

"means for "identifying multicast data packets associated with a multicast group;

means for monitoring transmissions of said multicast data packets between said intermediate device and said dedicated terminal by user devices".

It is therefore clear that Claim 18 as amended recites the existence of multicast data packets.

Similarly, Claim 27 recites:

"identifying multicast data packets associated with a multicast group;

monitoring transmissions of said multicast data packets".

It is therefore clear that Claim 27 recites the existence of multicast data packets.

Claims of 13 and 18 have been rejected as ambiguous. These claims have been amended to revise their preambles so as to remove any possible ambiguity. Subclaims 14 to 17 and 19 to 24 have been amended to be consistent with their parent Claims 13 and 18.

Claims 29-34 have been rejected under 35 USC 102 as anticipated by US 2002/0143951 to Kahn et al. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider this rejection. Nowhere does Kahn et al show or suggest:

"means for encapsulating said multicast data packets in a unicast frame",

as specifically set forth in Claim 29. Although Kahn et al shows means for encapsulating multicast data packets in a unicast packet, nowhere does Kahn et al show or suggest a unicast frame. Rather, Kahn et al uses the unicast packets without any frame. See paragraph 0022 of Kahn et al. It is therefore clear that Kahn et al does not affect the patentability of Claim 29.

Claims 30 and 31 are dependent from Claim 29 and set forth further advantageous features. The Applicants therefore submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 29.

Similarly nowhere does Kahn et al show or suggest:

"means for encapsulating said multicast data packets in a unicast frame",

as specifically set forth in Claim 32. Rather, Kahn et al uses the unicast packets without any frame. See paragraph 0022 of Kahn et al. It is therefore clear that Kahn et al does not affect the patentability of Claim 32.

Claims 33 and 34 are dependent from Claim 32 and add further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 32.

The Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that Claims 1-5 and 25-26 are allowed. The Applicants submit that Claims 6-24 and 27-34 are also allowable.

The Applicants submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Guillaume Bichot et al

by /Daniel E. Sragow/
Daniel E. Sragow, attorney
Reg. No. 22,856

Thomson Licensing LLC
Patent Operations
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312
Date: _072809_____